



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Four Centuries of Greek Learning in England. By INGRAM BYWATER. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1919. Pp. 20.

The manuscript of Bywater's inaugural lecture as Regius professor of Greek at Oxford (1893-1908) has recently been found in a collection of his notebooks and is published by the delegates of the Clarendon Press. Beginning with a discreet tribute to the "large-minded sympathies" of his predecessor Jowett, the lecturer outlines the story of the introduction of Greek studies into Oxford and England from Italy at the Renaissance, and then in the course of eight or ten pages reviews the history of the "English school" down to the time when Arnold, Thirlwall, and Grote for better or worse gave a wider and more liberal character to Greek scholarship in England. Since the lecture was written the comprehensive history of Sandys has appeared. But Bywater's pregnant résumé and in particular the precise estimate by an expert and a kindred spirit of the work of Bentley, Porson, and the Porsonians are still worth reading.

PAUL SHOREY

A. Cornelii Celsi quae supersunt: recensuit FRIDERICUS MARX. Leipzig: Teubner, 1915. Pp. cix+484. M. 18.

This is the first volume of the *Corpus Medicorum Latinorum*, undertaken by the Puschmann Institute of Leipzig. In format and plan it closely resembles the published volumes of the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*. A frontispiece reproduces Rembrandt's portrait of Van der Linden, whose edition of Celsus was hitherto by far the best. Full Prolegomena (pp. v-cix) discuss at length the encyclopedic work of Celsus as a whole in its relation to others of similar character, its constituent parts, the manuscripts, earlier editions, the principles of the present edition, the Greek source of Celsus in his *Medicina*, his style, his use of rhythm and clausula, and grammatical points of interest. The body of the volume (pp. 1-484) contains the testimonia, the fragments of the *Agricultura*, the text of the *Medicina*, the fragments of the *Rhetorica*, a conspectus of the contents of the *Medicina*, and indexes giving respectively proper names, Greek words, and Latin words, and matters of importance (far from exhaustion).

It may be said at the start that we now possess an edition of Celsus such as has long been wanted. Having had for years to content myself with the extremely unsatisfactory text of the Teubner edition by Daremberg, it is a great relief to turn to one that can be used with confidence. This is not equivalent to saying that Marx has done all that can be done for his author. Time was when I might have said that of this excellent edition, as I have thought and probably said it of other editions; but I have learned that all men are fallible, and that even the most favorable first impression may prove to be ill founded. The only test of an edition is that given by long use in the course of critical study of the whole field to which it belongs. For such a test of Marx's *Celsus* there has been no time; I have, however,

done the best I could do under the circumstances. I have taken my Daremberg and looked up the numerous passages which puzzled me or where I had reason to question the soundness of the text. In most instances the difficulties had disappeared, or at least there appeared to be offered something that might lead on further study to a satisfactory solution. If others more familiar with Celsus are as well served by the new edition as I have been in the first rapid survey, the editor will have rendered a distinct service.

The only desideratum which seems not to have been fully met is that in regard to the Latin index. The fact that Matthiae prepared a complete index to Van der Linden's text, published in Targa's edition, unsatisfactory and inconvenient as it is, is small comfort; when an edition such as Marx's is issued which offers a greatly improved text and is likely for long to be the standard, it is a pity that it should not be accompanied with a complete index, the value of which to the student cannot be estimated. On the other hand, the generous number of cross-references and parallel texts from other writers, Greek and Latin, added at the foot of the page between the text and the *apparatus criticus*, is a real boon to the serious student, greatly facilitating the use and enhancing the value of the text. I have here noted the omission of a few parallels from Hippocrates, but they are rather trivial as far as my observation goes.

Of the matters considered in the Prolegomena the most interesting to me is the proof (so the editor calls it, and so the critical reader will, I believe, pronounce it) that the *Medicina* of Celsus is a translation of the Greek treatise of T. Aufidius Siculus. The argument is conducted carefully and methodically, and all reasonable doubt of the correctness of the conclusion is removed. On the whole one will be pleased also with the editor's judgment in constituting the text. Here, however, the problems, as in all medical writers, are so complicated by our want of intimate knowledge of the ancient remedies that the judicious student will often be in doubt—more often than even the frankest editor will be likely to admit. Some special points at which I now think I might improve the text I will mention later, if they stand the test of maturer consideration. Meanwhile it is a source of satisfaction that we have a text provided with a record of the manuscript tradition on which one may safely proceed in a critical reading of an author from many points of view worth studying.

W. A. HEIDEL

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompeius. Zweite verbesserte Auflage. By EDUARD MEYER. Stuttgart, 1919. Pp. 632.

This second edition contains a score of minor corrections of the first edition, which, published in 1918, reached but few of our libraries. The thesis of the book is, as might be inferred from the title, that the form of